



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

IV.—CLITARCHUS.

I.

Clitarchus and Onesicritus are representatives of the same form of rhetorical embellishment in history, and the characterization of the latter by Strabo xv. 1. 28 C 698 might be applied to the former. Their literary relation needs, not demonstration, but merely illustration. Strabo xv. 1. 30 C 699 (from Onesicritus) and Diodorus xvii. 91. 3, with the same Greek words differently arranged, state that in India wives were burned with their dead husbands. Strabo also, in xv. 2. 14 C 726, says there is a gold-bearing river in Carmania. This is, according to Pliny *N. H.* vi. 23 (26). 98, Hyctanis, (flumen) portuosum et auro fertile. Curtius generalizes the statement in viii. 9. 18 aurum flumina vehunt, and the entire description, although derived immediately from Clitarchus, goes back to Onesicritus. So intimately are the two writers associated that it is impossible to determine all the threads woven by each in the later history of Alexander. Still it will be not an altogether fruitless task to consider the actual and also the probable contribution of each to the history of Alexander.

At the outset we are met with uncertainty in all the chronological data in regard to the original writers of the history of Alexander. If we assume that all we have in regard to the seer Aristander is from Callisthenes, the latest date for the close of C.'s work should be 328 B. C., when Aristander is mentioned for the last time. An item in Arrian, *Anabasis* vii. 18. 5, shows that Aristobulus wrote after the battle of Ipsus, 301 B. C. But the original comment by Arrian in *Anabasis* vii. 22. 5 on the greatness of Seleucus, in connection with the other statement, may be taken as an indication that Aristobulus wrote before the defeat of Lysimachus at Corupedion, when Seleucus became master of the larger part of the empire of Alexander. Judging by these passages, the limits would be 301 and 281 B. C. Fränkel (*Die Quellen der Alexanderhistoriker*, p. 123), accepting a misapplication of the words of Arrian *Anabasis* vii. 29, places him after 294 or 287 B. C. This is supported by a calculation

based on Lucian *Macrob.* 22, which says that Aristobulus began his history at the age of 84. If 50 at the death of Alexander, then 323 B. C.—(84-50) = 289 B. C. But absolutely nothing is known about the age of Aristobulus at the death of Alexander, and in spite of Lucian's statement taken from the preface to the work of Aristobulus, he tells us in *The Way to Write History* 12 how Alexander disposed of one chapter of the history, thus giving evidence for an early as well as for a late date of composition. Onesicritus read the story of the Queen of the Amazons, πολλοῖς χρόνοις ὕστερον (Plutarch *Alexander* 46), to Lysimachus who assumed the title of king in 304, and was killed in 281 B. C., and the reading may be placed anywhere between these two dates. The last mention of Nearchus is for the year 312 B. C. The compilation of the work of Ptolemy may belong to the quiet years of his reign before his death in 283 B. C. Arrian, and Curtius in ix. 5. 21, indicate a decided Ptolemaic coloring, and, on the basis of this, we may imagine that near the close of his reign the king received a copy of the work of Aristobulus, and in reply published his history of Alexander. But this hypothesis can be reversed, and in fact all the chronological data are so indefinite that any of them can be shifted to suit any theory of literary relationship.

Very little is known of the personal history of Clitarchus. Pliny *N. H.* x. 49(70). 136 states that he was the son of Dinon whose history of Persian affairs extended to the invasion of Egypt by Ochus. If the continuation of his work was prevented by death, about 351 B. C. must be the latest assignable date for the birth of Clitarchus. Yet the statement in Pliny: Nec Sirenes impetraverint fidem, adfirmet licet Dinon Clitarchi celebrati auctoris pater in India esse, mulcerique earum cantu quos gravatos somno lacerent, indicates a later date, though Pliny may have confused father and son. Compare *Ælian Hist. Anim.* xvii, 23, where the Sirens are mentioned in a quotation from Clitarchus.

Diodorus ii. 3. 7 does not include Clitarchus among the writers who accompanied Alexander on his Asiatic campaign, and he may not have been an original observer of the facts which he records. On this point also there may be various interpretations. Strabo quotes freely from Aristobulus, Nearchus and Onesicritus, but rejects the statement of Clitarchus in three of the five

passages where he is mentioned, and in another summarily passes him by. Plutarch merely mentions him (*Alexander* 46; and *Themistocles* 27). Still Pliny the Elder and Ælian seem more favorably inclined, the former quoting quite freely from him, and the latter (*Hist. Anim.* xvii. 2; 22-23; and 25), giving, as if they were original, his descriptions of monkeys, birds and snakes. What we get from the Romans seems to favor his originality. The crystallized critical view is given by Quintilian x. 1. 74; probatur ingenium, fides infamatur. Similar to this is Cicero, *Brutus* 11. 42, where, speaking of the description by Clitarchus and Stratocles of the death of Themistocles, there is added: Hanc enim mortem rhetorice et tragice ornare potuerunt. Cicero also says, in *De Legg.* i. 2. 8, that Sisenna had acquired "puerile quiddam," as if he had read none of the Greeks except Clitarchus. However, reliance on him for historical data is attested by Cicero *ad Fam.* ii. 10 (to Caelius), and by Pliny's application to him of the words "celebratus auctor." Curtius in ix. 8. 15 names him as authority for a number which Diodorus xvii. 102. 6 accepts without question, and in ix. 5. 21 belabors him and Timagenes for a mistake about Ptolemy.

The date when Clitarchus wrote can not be determined. Arrian, *Anabasis* vii. 26. 3, states that Aristobulus and Ptolemy have nothing further about the death of Alexander, and then gives, from an unknown source, an account of the poisoning plot. This is set forth in the works derived from Clitarchus—Justinus xii. 14; Curtius x. 10. 14-19; Diodorus xvii. 118. 1-2; and Plutarch *Alexander* 77. The last writer says that no one had any suspicion of the plot until the sixth year after the death of Alexander. If Clitarchus was under the protection of Olympias he may have written at that time. But Diodorus (section 2) declares that most writers did not dare to mention the plot until after the death of Cassander, which was in 297 B. C.

Strabo xvii. 1. 8 C 794 relates that the body of Alexander was buried in Alexandria where it still lay, and Suetonius *Aug.* 18 agrees with the latter part of the statement; cf. *Cal.* 52. See also Curtius x. 10. 19-20: Regnum enim Macedoniae Antipater et Graeciam quoque invasit: suboles deinde excepit interfectis omnibus, quicumque Alexandrum etiam longinqua cognatione contigerant. Ceterum corpus eius a Ptolemæo, cui Ægyptus

cesserat, Memphim et inde paucis post annis Alexandriam translatum est omnisque memoriae ac nomini honos habitus. Diodorus xviii. 28. 2 says that after two years' preparation Arrhidæus started to transfer the body of Alexander from Babylon to Egypt, but Ptolemy advancing as far as Syria decided to place it in Alexandria. Pausanias i. 6. 3 mentions Memphis, as does Curtius, but tells us that the removal from the place was by Ptolemy Philadelphus. This is probably incorrect, yet we may well believe that it was well within the reign of the first Ptolemy before Alexandria attained such prominence as to make it the fittest resting-place for Alexander. If the statement of Curtius was derived from Clitarchus, it merely shows that the latter wrote some time after the removal of the body of Alexander. However, the words "suboles exceptit, interfectis omnibus" refer to some time after 308 B. C., when Cleopatra, the last survivor of the royal house of Macedon, was assassinated by Cassander. From these two indefinite statements we get only the indefinite conclusions, perhaps after 308, perhaps after 297 B. C.

The number of books in the work of Clitarchus is unknown. The scholiast to Aristophanes *Birds* 487 gives an item from the tenth book, and Diogenes Laertius v. 6 Prooem. one from the twelfth, although this assignment may really be to Clearchus who is mentioned in the same passage.

Ancient critics did not fail to notice the rhetorical character of his work. Longinus *De Sublimitate* 3. 2, after mentioning Gorgias of Leontini, continues: "So it is with some of the expressions of Callisthenes which are not sublime but high-flown, and still more with those of Cleitarchus, for the man is frivolous and blows 'On pigmy hautboys, mouthpiece have they none.'" (Translations by Roberts and Way.) Roberts also states, p. 223 s. v. *Cleitarchus*, "It seems hitherto to have escaped notice that the frigidity of Cleitarchus' style is condemned in the *Rhetoric* of Philodemus the Epicurean [ψυχρό]τερον δ τῷ Κλειταρχείου, frigidius vel Clitarchico sermone. Herculan. volum. xi. 37." This is in accord with the judgment of Demetrius, *De Elocutione* 304, where he quotes from Clitarchus in regard to the anthredon or tenthredon: "It lays waste the hill-country and dashes into the hollow oaks. This might have served for a description of some wild ox or of the Erymanthian boar, rather than a species of bee. The result is that the passage

is both repellent and frigid" (Translation by Roberts). This is like Goldsmith's criticism: "Dr. Johnson, if you were to make little fishes talk they would talk like big whales." But in fairness to Clitarchus it should be noticed that the wording in Diodorus xvii. 75. 5-6 is very different. After mentioning the vine, the fig-tree and the honey-tree in Hyrcania, he adds: "There is a winged insect in the land, less in size than the bee, but of the greatest usefulness. Flitting over the hill-country it gathers for itself flowers of every kind, and living in the hollow rocks and in the lightning-struck trees, it works in wax, and prepares a liquid excelling in sweetness and not much inferior to honey among us." If Diodorus reproduces Clitarchus, Demetrius gives a parody in which *κατανέμεται* is substituted for *ἐπινεμόμενον*, and *εἰσπίπτται* for *ἐνδιατρίβον*. Strabo ii. 1. 14 C 73 gives the first items the same as Diodorus, but is silent in regard to the tenthredon. Pliny *N. H.* xii. 8 (18). 34 (cf. Curt. vi. 4. 22) quotes from Onesicritus in regard to the honey-tree, and in xv. 18(19). 68 in regard to the fig. These assignments mark Onesicritus as the original author of the statements, and, judging by Diodorus, Clitarchus added the description of the tenthredon, and this was parodied by Demetrius in the spirit of Clitarchus himself. That he added items to the account of Onesicritus is also indicated by other statements.

Strabo vii. 2. 1 C 293 criticizes an item from Clitarchus which says that the horsemen of Alexander were almost overtaken by the tide from the Ocean. This is a part—*equites ingenti cursu refugere, et secutus est aestus*—in the long description in Curtius ix. 9. 9 ff. It was a veritable deluge, and may well be considered as an addition to the account, probably from Onesicritus, which is given in Pliny *N. H.* xiii. 25(51). 141. After mentioning the soldiers he adds: *Eodem tractu insularum silvas operit aestus, quamquam altiores platanis populisque altissimis . . . harum minores totas integit mare. maximarum cacumina extant, ad quae naves religantur, et cum recessit aestus, ad radices.* The tides are not mentioned by either Diodorus or Plutarch, and only incidentally by Arrian vi. 18. 4. As Clitarchus seems to have added to the account of Onesicritus, so Curtius added to Clitarchus by giving reminiscences of Sallust and Livy, Vergil and Ovid. On the strength of the statement

in Plutarch *Alexander* 46 it may be held that Onesicritus put into shape the story of the Queen of the Amazons, which had as its real basis Alexander's statement that a Scythian princess had been offered him as a wife. Strabo xi. 5. 4 C 505 quotes from Clitarchus that Thalestria came from the Caspian Gates and the Thermodon, and then adds that these two were 6000 stades apart. Both these items from Clitarchus indicate the way in which he dealt with the work of Onesicritus.

There is another criticism which fits Clitarchus, although it may not have been so intended. Longinus *De Sublimitate* 4. 7 criticises the expression in Herodotus v. 18 to the effect that beautiful women are "eye-smarts," τὰς καλὰς γυναῖκας "ἀλγῆδόνας ὀφθαλμῶν," and Plutarch *Alexander* 21 gives, perhaps from Clitarchus, a remark of Alexander in regard to Persian women εἰς ἰν ἀλγῆδόνες ὀμμάτων αἱ Περσίδες, in which the Greek is slightly different.

II.

In spite of his importance as a writer the material directly assigned to him is provokingly small. More than a dozen of his proverbial passages have been preserved, and if we had only these, he might be ranked as a keen-sighted philosopher, free from the defects of rhetorical exaggeration. *Ab tribus omnia disce.* Stobaeus 53. 13 (Meineke ii. 314): πᾶσα τόλμη καὶ τὰ τῆς δυνάμεως ὑπερβαίνει μέτρα: "Boldness transcends even the limits of power"; Meineke iv. 143, *Addenda* 2: Ἀγωνιζόμενος ὑπὲρ οὐ ἀδίκως ἔπραξας δις ἀδικήσεις: "Defending what you unjustly did, twice shall you be unjust"; Meineke iv. 239. 2: Ὅφείλομεν ἑαυτοὺς ἐθίζειν ἀπ' ὀλίγων ζῆν, ἵνα μηδὲν αἰσχρὸν ἕνεκεν χρημάτων πάθωμεν: "We ought to habituate ourselves to live on slender means, that we may suffer no disgrace in our pursuit of money."

With the exception of the two references in Curtius, and a few others, the fragments give us incidents associated with the career of Alexander, rather than his acts. They fall into four classes: 1. Incidental references used as illustrations; 2. Passages the substance of which is found in other works; 3. Short statements which are found elsewhere in expanded form; and 4. Items which are assigned to other writers also.

1. Strabo v. 2. 6 C 224 refers to the salts of India mentioned by Clitarchus, and in xv. 1. 69 C 718 says that the full

description of the orion and the catreus must be read in Clitarchus, while Ælian *Hist. Anim.* xvii. 22-23 more generously quotes the entire passage. A scholium to Aristophanes *Birds* 487 tells how the Persian kings wore the tiara, and one to Theocritus *Id.* ii. 59 is in regard to the use of the word *θρόνον* among the Ætoliens.

2. A few items specifically assigned by one writer, are undesignated in others. Pliny *N. H.* vi. 31(36). 198 describes the richness of the islands of the Indian ocean, and Curtius x. 1. 11 has an adaptation of the same account. Athenaeus iv. 148d, quoted from Clitarchus, shows the source of Diodorus xvii. 14. 4 in regard to the wealth of the Thebans, though the menu given by Athenaeus is omitted.

3. Athenaeus xiii. 576d denies that Thais was with Alexander, but quotes Clitarchus as authority for the report that she was responsible for the burning of Persepolis. Diodorus xvii. 72; Plutarch *Alexander* 38; and Curtius v. 7 associate her with the act of Alexander. Strabo xv. 3. 6 C 729 and Arrian *Anabasis* iii. 18. 11, without mentioning her, say that Alexander wished to avenge injuries done to the Greeks by the Persians. With this story may be placed that about the queen of the Amazons toward which Strabo and Arrian have the same critical attitude; see *Class. Phil.* XIII, 306.

4. The association with Clitarchus of Timagenes by Curtius ix. 5. 21 (the presence of Ptolemy in a battle); of Theopompus by Athenaeus xiii. 586c (Harpalus and Glycera); of Hesiod and later writers by the scholiast (the metamorphosis of Teiresias) are examples of cumulative references, and of the facile acceptance by writers of what they found in the works of their predecessors. One of the best illustrations of this is the scholium to Apollonius Rhodius *Argonautica* ii. 904 in regard to Dionysus. Division of sentiment is shown in Plutarch *Themistocles* 27, where the authority of Charon and Thucydides is opposed to that of Ephorus, Deinon, Clitarchus and Heracleides.

Most of this material is not found in either Diodorus or Curtius, and there is in it nothing marvelous excepting about Teiresias, Thais, Thalestria, the tenthredon and the tides. In favor of the Clitarchan derivation of at least some of the marvelous that is unassigned is the fact that it is not found in

Arrian. However, this is not a sure test for the source of all that is marvelous in Curtius.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus *De Compositione Verborum* 18 tells of the treatment by Alexander of Betis the commander at Gaza. This is not mentioned by Diodorus xvii. 48. 7, nor by Plutarch *Alexander* 25, nor in the brief statement by Josephus *Ant. Iud.* xi. 8. 3, where he is called Bubemesis instead of Betis. Dionysius after giving one account follows with a quotation from Hegesias, some parts of which are parallel to Curtius iv. 6. 7 ff. Strabo quotes from him in viii. 1. 16 C 396, and criticises him in xiv. 1. 41 C 648. Cicero parodies his style *ad Att.* xii. 6, and condemns him (*Orator* 67. 226): *Saltat incidens particulas; as also (Brutus 83. 287): At quid est tam fractum, tam minutum, tam in ipsa . . . concinnitate puerile?* These quotations indicate his rhetorical importance, while Plutarch *Alexander* 3 shows that he drew some of his subjects from the life of Alexander. It is reasonable to suppose that he was known to Curtius, and that from him came the description of the death of Betis. Not only may the story be derived from Hegesias, but there may also be an imitation of his style in section 28: *Videtisne obstinatum ad tacendum? num genu posuit? num vocem supplicem misit?*

There are also some passages which can be traced to other sources than Clitarchus. Strabo xv. 1. 39 C 703—52 C 707, and Arrian *Indica* 11-12 give, from Megasthenes, an account of the classes in India, and practically the same facts are found in Diodorus ii. 40-41, and in the use of Greek he does not differ more widely from the others than they differ from each other. As Megasthenes was at hand for Strabo, there is no need of an assumption that Diodorus did not draw from the same source.

Matthew Arnold in *The Study of Poetry* speaks of "an infallible touchstone for detecting the presence or absence of high poetic quality and also the degree of this quality," but for the facts of Clitarchus there can be nothing more than a theoretical reconstruction based on the similarities and divergences found in later writers. Unity of narrative is given as a criterion, although this may be found in a passage made up from several sources. "Near the Acesines river, which was fifteen stades in width, the Macedonians found great trees, and under the shade of one a myriad of men could rest. Their branches

grew downward, and among them were seen large apes almost human in appearance. On the ground crawled monstrous snakes, one of which seized Python the son of Antigenes." This passage does not lack unity, though the items came from Aristobulus, Nearchus, Onesicritus and Ptolemy. At most, unity merely shows that some one has brought into harmonious relations a number of separate elements observed by himself or others. The problem of combining items from several writers giving their original observations is exactly the same as that of one writer making the same observations and combining them into one account.

The dictum *simplex et unum* is merely a suggested line of investigation, and conclusions will differ. At many a turn in the history of Alexander we are met with the query Does a single item that is assigned to some author prove the authorship of the context, or is it extraneous matter introduced for illustration? Diodorus ii. 7 refers to both Ktesias and Clitarchus in his description of Babylon, and some of the same items in Curtius v. 1. 24 ff. might seem to fix Clitarchus as the source for the passage in Diodorus. Yet there is a close resemblance between Curtius and Strabo xvi. 1. 5 C 738, and the reference to the "Wonders" cannot be from Clitarchus, unless he wrote after the erection of the Pharos under Ptolemy Philadelphus. However the question is of most interest in regard to the fifteenth book of Strabo and the *Alexander* of Plutarch.

We find in the first section of the latter the significant remark: "Some little deed, some word or jest has put an emphasis on character more than fights with myriads slain, battle lines the greatest or siege of cities." Plutarch's work is a *vita* not a *historia*, and the quotations are little sidelights showing the wide extent of the field from which he gleaned his material. No one writer could give more than a little to illustrate the many-sidedness of Alexander, and Plutarch has given us a little from many, rather than much from a few. His quotations from Menander (17) and Sophocles (7), from Chares (20) in regard to the wounding of Alexander at Issus, from Sotion (61) about a pet dog, and many other statements, either definitely or indefinitely assigned, are merely to throw light on, rather than to indicate the source of the context.

Let us apply this conclusion to the *Alexander* 31-33 which contains an account of the battle at Arbela. Callisthenes is twice

mentioned, at the beginning, for the prayer of Alexander, and near the end, for an interpretation of the attitude of Parmenio toward Alexander. That the reference to Callisthenes is purely incidental is indicated by another quotation in 31. There was a fight between two sections of the army, so the story runs, and the one called "Alexander" was victor, receiving twelve villages as a reward. "These things says Eratosthenes." Then it is stated that the great battle took place, not at Arbela, but at Gaugamela. Arrian *Anabasis* vi. 11. 5 tells us that both Aristobulus and Ptolemy mention this fact, and it is also found in Strabo xvi. 1. 3. C 737. The last item coming down from the time of Aristobulus was put in to correct what had been recorded by Diodorus, and the narrative was illuminated by two quotations from Callisthenes, one from Eratosthenes, and an item credited to "they say." If Plutarch reproduces the description by Callisthenes, it is passing strange that two items should have been picked out and assigned to him, when all was his. There would be as little need for this as for a writer beginning a long quotation with the words "Four score and seven years ago," to close, "As Lincoln says in his Speech at Gettysburg 'that government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth.'"

We may perhaps safely assume that the larger part of Diodorus xvii, as also of Justinus xi-xii, is derived from Clitarchus. Yet the brevity of the work of Justinus limits its use for purposes of comparison, and, in addition, some of his statements have evidently been changed in transmission. The Diodorus-Curtius account gives 10,000 as the number of horsemen among the Malli, and this shows that an l has been added in Justinus xii. 9. 3 lx milia. We find in Curtius viii. 11. 1: Hinc Polypercon ad urbem Noram cum exercitu missus, but in Justinus xii. 10. 1 Polyperconta cum exercitu Babyloniam mittit; it appears the Greek name Ὀρρα (Arrian *Anabasis* iv. 28. 4) with some other letters was mistaken for Βαβυλῶνα. There are numerous instances of absolute agreement between Diodorus and Curtius, as also between the latter and Justinus (Pompeius Trogus). In such cases Curtius may have used Clitarchus, or he may have used only the later writers. When the difference is merely in the details, Clitarchus may be the source for all. Justinus xi. 15. 1 gives Thara as the place where Darius was seized by Bessus; Curtius

v. 13. 24 and Plutarch *Alexander* 43 name Polystratus as the Macedonian by whom he was found. All these items may have been given by Clitarchus, and later writers who based their works on his, followed their own stylistic sense in the selection of details. But in Curtius there are also indications that at times he went over to the Aristobulan tradition, as in ix. 5. 9 super latus; Arrian *Anabasis* vi. 10. 1 ὑπὲρ τὸν μαστόν; Diodorus xvii. 99. 3 ὑπὸ τὸν μαστόν; Justinus 12. 9. 12 sub mamma. There are differences more marked in other passages, and we may safely hold that Arrian emphasizes the narrative of Aristobulus to disparage that of Clitarchus. Of the many instances where this is possible we shall mention only the personal combats of Alexander at the Granicus (*Anab.* i. 15. 7: Diod. xvii. 20. 3-7); the wounding of Alexander among the Malli (*Anab.* vi. 9-11: Diod. xvii. 98. 5-99. 4); and the return to the Hydaspes (*Anab.* v. 29. 5: Diod. xvii. 95. 3).

In addition to differences in fact stated, there are also expressional variations in which there are two noticeable features: 1. A change in the order of terms; and 2. Variations in verbal statement.

1. A change in the arrangement of words is generally a sure sign of the use of the same source, and finds its best illustration in the quotations or adaptations of Livy by Curtius, in the abridgement of Pompeius Trogus (Justinus) by Orosius, and, in another field, in the reproduction of parts of Pliny's *Naturalis Historia* by Martianus Capella. There being no originality to be shown in the statement of the same fact, a show of it was gained by changing the arrangement of the terms. As an illustration we may cite Strabo xv. 1. 28 C 698, having the size of the kingdom of Taxiles at the close of the description, while Plutarch *Alexander* 59 has it at the beginning. Some words of Arrian *Anabasis* i. 21. 1-4, and of Diodorus xvii. 25. 5-6 will also be given: sec. 1: Οὐ πολλαῖς δὲ ἡμέραις ὕστερον δύο τῶν Μακεδόνων ὀπλῖται ἐκ τῆς [ὕστερον] Περδικκον τάξεως ξυσκηνοῦντές τε καὶ ἅμα ξυμπίνοντες αὐτόν τε καὶ τὰ αὐτοῦ ἐκάτερος ἐπὶ μέγα τῷ λόγῳ ἦγεν; and in 4: καὶ δύο πύργοι καὶ μεσοπύργιον ἐς ἔδαφος καταπεπτωκότα; Diod.: Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα δύο μὲν πύργων εἰς ἔδαφος καθηρημένων καὶ θυεῖν μεσοπυργίων ἐρριμμένων τῶν μὲν Περδικκον στρατιωτῶν τινες μεθυσθέντες προπετῶς νυκτὸς προσέβαλλον τοῖς τῆς ἀκροπόλεως τευχέσιν. The associated statements are good illustrations of variational

quotations : Arr. : Ἐνθα δὴ φιλοτιμία τε ἐσπιπτεῖ αὐτοῖς, καὶ τι καὶ ὁ οἶνος ὑπεθέρμαινεν, ὥστε ὀπλισάμενοι αὐτοὶ ἐπὶ σφῶν προσβάλλουσι τῷ τείχει κατὰ τὴν ἄκραν . . . καὶ τούτους κατιδόντες τινὲς τῶν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως δύο τε ὄντας καὶ οὐ ξὺν λογισμῷ προσφερομένους τῷ τείχει ἐπεκθέουσιν ; Diod. : οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Μένονα συννοήσαντες τὴν ἀπειρίαν τῶν προσβαλλόντων ; Arr. : Καὶ ξυμπίπτει μάχη καρτερὰ πρὸς τῷ τείχει · καὶ κατακλείονται αὐθις πρὸς τῶν Μακεδόνων εἰσω τῶν πυλῶν οἱ ἐπεκδραμόντες ; Diod. : Καὶ μεγάλῃς μάχῃς γενομένης καὶ τῶν περὶ τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον ἐπιφανέντων οἱ μὲν Πέρσαι βιασθέντες συνεκλείσθησαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν. The passage is about twice as long in Arrian as in Diodorus, and we can not tell whether some original has been contracted by one, or expanded by the other. But, whichever way it was, the setting in Arrian suggests that it was written with an eye to what had already been set forth by Diodorus.

III.

There are no definite indications that Clitarchus made use of the work of Callisthenes, the only historian of Alexander who certainly preceded him. Though little weight can be attached to numbers, it is interesting to compare some of his with those from other sources. The number of men under Alexander when he entered Asia is stated as follows :

	Footmen.	Horsemen.
Callisthenes (Polybius xii. 19. 1)	40000	4500
Aristobulus (Plutarch <i>De Alex. Fort.</i> Or. I 3. 327 D)	30000	4000
Anaximenes (Plutarch <i>De Alex. Fort.</i>)	43000	5500
Ptolemy " " "	30000	5000
Plutarch <i>Alexander</i> 15 minimum	30000	4000
" " " maximum	43000	5000
Diodorus xvii. 17. 4 ; Justinus xi. 6. 2	32000	4500

Aristobulus gives the minimum number (30000:4000), while the other five sets are different, and it is only in the number of horsemen that Diodorus agrees with Callisthenes. Arrian *Anabasis* i. 11. 3 follows Ptolemy. In the same connection Polybius (from Callisthenes) has 5000:800 as the number of men joining Alexander in Asia before the battle of Issus, while Arrian *Anabasis* i. 29. 4 gives 3000:650 for the same period.

There are however four fragments which give material for a comparison with the narrative of other writers. These are 1. The passage of the Climax; 2. The battle at Issus; 3. The visit to the shrine of Ammon; and 4. The statue of Sardanapalus.

1. Josephus *Ant. Iud.* ii. 16. 5 compares the passage with that of the Israelites through the Red Sea, adding that it was described by all writers of the affairs of Alexander. Strabo xiv. 3. 9 C 666 says that Alexander passed through in the winter season, relying on chance (τῇ τύχῃ). But Eustathius on Homer *Il.* xiii. 29 quotes from Callisthenes in regard to the obeisance of the sea in the presence of the king. Arrian *Anabasis* i. 26. 2 relates that in the eyes of Alexander and his friends the accomplishment was οὐκ ἄνευ τοῦ θείου. Plutarch *Alexander* 17 quotes from Menander, and also states that many writers mention θεία τινὶ τύχῃ, though Alexander in his epistles denies that there was anything divine about it. Inasmuch as Diodorus who uses τύχῃ freely does not mention this episode, it may be taken as proof that it was not mentioned at all by Clitarchus.

2. Polybius xii. 19 ff. reviews and points out the defects in the description by Callisthenes of the battle at Issus. Arrian *Anabasis* ii. 8 ff. eliminates the difficulties in the narrative of Callisthenes, while Plutarch *Alexander* 20 has little about the battle itself, but quotes from the letters of Alexander, and from Chares in regard to the wounding of Alexander by Darius. Diodorus xvii. 33. 1 puts the horsemen in front, the phalanx in the rear, thus reversing the positions assigned by Arrian ii. 8. 2, and in section 2 characterizes the Thessalians who are barely mentioned by Arrian. His account in general bears no relation to that of Callisthenes, while Curtius closely resembles Arrian.

3. Strabo xvii. 1. 43 C 814 relates that Alexander greatly desired to visit the shrine of Ammon, when he heard that Perseus and Hercules had been there before him. He then mentions the departure from Paraetium, the wandering, the rains, and the ravens leading the way. Plutarch *Alexander* 27 (from Callisthenes) adds that their cries directed the Macedonians by night. All the other accounts have the story of the ravens, but Ptolemy (Arrian *Anabasis* iii. 3. 5) says that two dragons went before the army uttering cries. Diodorus xii. 51. 3 quotes the declaration of the priest that Alexander would be invincible (ἀνίκητον),

as does Curtius iv. 7. 28 (*invictum*). This may be taken as an addition by Clitarchus, as Plutarch *Alexander* 14 gives it as the declaration of the priestess at Delphi.

4. The statue of Sardanapalus at Anchiale had on it an inscription in Assyrian stating that he had captured Anchiale and Tarsus in one day. "Eat, drink, and be merry, for all else is not worth this"—that is, the snap indicated by the position of the fingers of the right hand. The details of the description vary with different writers who may be classified according to the translation of the last word. Callisthenes (Fr. 32) has ἔσθιε, πῖνε, ὄχευε. Plutarch *De Alexandri magni Fortuna aut Virtute* Or. ii. 3. 336 C changes the last word to ἀφροδισίαζε. Arrian *Anabasis* ii. 5. 4 (without assignment); Athenaeus xii. 530a, and Strabo xiv. 5. 9 C 672 have παῖζε. Strabo also gives from Choerilus: ταῦτ' ἔχω, ὅσος' ἔφαγον καὶ ἀφύβρισα, καὶ μετ' ἔρωτος τέρπν' ἔπαθον. The adaptation by Choerilus is the prevailing form, as in Diodorus ii. 23. 3; Polybius vii. 12. 4; Plutarch *De Alex. Fort.* i. 9. 330 F and *De se . . . laudando* 17; and the scholiast on Aristoph. *Birds* 1022, who states that it was quoted by Apollodorus. The poetical form probably gives the content of the inscription on the tomb of Sardanapalus; the prose form that on the monument, given literally by Callisthenes and softened by Aristobulus. Compare the Septuagint rendition of Ecclesiastes viii. 15 εἰ μὴ τοῦ φαγεῖν καὶ τοῦ πίνειν καὶ τοῦ εὐφρανθῆναι, both the original and the translation being produced under Alexandrian influences. Clitarchus (Athenaeus xii. 530a) mentions the death of the king, but nothing is indicated in regard to any inscription.

IV.

Through Arrian we have the facts of Aristobulus, and through Diodorus, Curtius and Pompeius Trogus (Justinus) the facts and fancies of the Clitarchan tradition. There are uncounted differences in numbers, and even the same writer, in the text as we have it, does not always give the same in different connections. According to Curtius vii. 9. 13, Alexander pursued the Scythians 80 stades. Plutarch *Alexander* 45 has 100, and in *De Magni Alexandri Fortuna aut Virtute* Or. ii. 9. 341 C, 150. Numbers are a sort of unmental element in the narrative, and differences in statement, where it is a matter of a greater or

lesser number of strokes of the pen, are of little moment, and many differences are merely the result of changes in transmission. Yet there are some which indicate original differences in statement. Arrian *Anabasis* v. 3. 5 says that Taxiles gave to Alexander 200 talents of silver, 3000 sacred cattle, above a myriad of sheep, and 30 elephants. Curtius has in viii. 12. 11: lvi elephanti erant . . . multa pecora eximiae magnitudinis, tauros ad iii milia; and in section 15 signati argenti lxxx talenta. The definite numbers in the first group are separated by the indefinite, *multa* is for myriad, one is not given with the others, and two are different from Arrian's.

Many of the variations in names count for nothing, as they are due to mistakes in copying or to mistaken inferences. When Diodorus has Ballonymus, Bagodaras and Mophis which appear in Curtius as Abdalonymus, Cobares and Omphis, it is clear that there has been merely varying transmission. Noticeable are the different accounts of the combats of Alexander at the battle of the Granicus. Arrian *Anabasis* i. 15. 7 says that he struck Mithridates on the head with a spear, and was struck by Rhoesakes whom he killed. Spithridates raised his ax against Alexander, but Clitus the son of Dropides anticipating the blow cut off his forearm. Diodorus xvii. 20 says that Spithrobates made the attack and was killed by Alexander. Then came the assault of his brother Rhosakes whose hand was cut off by Clitus the Black. Plutarch *Alexander* 16 relates that Spithridates was slain by Clitus (cf. 50), and Rhoesakes by Alexander, while in *De Alex. Fort.* Or. ii. 2. 326 F Mithridates and Spithridates are mentioned.

Arrian *Anabasis* vi. 11. 1 states that some give Critodemus Cous, and some Perdicas as the one who extracted the arrow from Alexander when he was wounded among the Malli. The *Indica* 18. 6 (from Nearchus) names Critobulus Cous among the men on the fleet, and we find in Curtius ix. 5. 25 Critobulus, inter medicos artis eximiae, as if he were the one who extracted the arrow from the eye of Philip, citra deformitatem oris (Pliny *N. H.* vii. 37(37). 124). As some of the authors, and all of the scribes were inditing matters which were outside of their own personal experience, it is not strange that confusion should sometimes arise, as in Diodorus xvii. 25. 5, where among the dead Macedonians is mentioned Neoptolemus their leader,

an illustrious man. Arrian *Anabasis* i. 20. 10 names among the slain Persians, Neoptolemus, the son of Arrabaeus, brother of Amyntas, one of those in exile at the court of Darius.

We find in the above, from Arrian, Clitus the son of Dropides, and Neoptolemus the son of Arrabaeus, but, in Diodorus, Clitus the Black and Neoptolemus. There is the same difference in Arrian *Anabasis* i. 7. 6; i. 17. 8; i. 25. 1 Alexander the son of Aeropus; but in Diodorus xvii. 32. 1; Curt. vii. 1. 5 et al. Lyncestes Alexander; Just. xi. 2. 2. et al. Alexander Lyncesta. Notice also *Anabasis* iii. 11. 10 Erigyus the son of Larichus; Diodorus xvii. 57. 3 Erigyus the Mitylenaeus; *Anabasis* iii. 12. 4 Agathon the son of Tyrimma: Diodorus xvii. 64. 5 Agathon the Pydnaean; *Anabasis* ii. 12. 2 Menes the son of Dionysius: Diodorus xvii. 64. 5 Menes the Pellaeus. Arrian (Aristobulus) is always very careful in his personal designations, as is shown by the list of ten names in *Anabasis* i. 14, and of fifteen in iii. 11. 8-11. In Diodorus xvii. 57 also, Nicanor and Philotas are designated as the sons of Parmenio, but only one other, Philip the son of Balacrus, as in Curtius iv. 13. 28, for which Arrian *Anabasis* iii. 11. 10 has Philip the son of Menelaus.

We do not have from Aristobulus the names of the men among whom the empire of Alexander was divided, but the short list in Curtius x. 10. 1-4 does not, in any case, indicate the father, nor does Diodorus xviii. 3, except for Ptolemy. Justinus xiii. 4. 10-13 names the father of Antigonus, Cassander and Seleucus, and has Pithon the son of Agenor to distinguish him from Pithon Illyrius. But we find Laomedon Mytilenaeus, Soleus Staganor, Archon Pellaeus, and these when mentioned by Arrian are not designated in this way. In only a few instances is there agreement, as in *Anabasis* i. 14. 3 and Diodorus xvii. 17. 4 Calas the son of Harpalus; *Anabasis* i. 8. 2 et al. and Diodorus xvii. 45. 7 Amyntas the son of Andromenes. The *Anabasis* gives us the type of designation for Aristobulus, and the *Indica* that for Nearchus. Diodorus has done the same for Clitarchus, and the two types are entirely distinct.

The names given by Pliny from Onesicritus are different from those in Arrian's *Indica* from Nearchus, as each writer was free to name new places as he pleased. There are also some indications of the same freedom in other connections. Curtius vii. 11 describes the capture of the rock, 30 by 150 stades, of Arimazes

Sogdianus. This is mentioned by Strabo xi. 11. 4 C 517, and by Arrian *Anabasis* iv. 18. 4-7 as the place where the children of Oxyartes were captured. Curtius viii. 2. 19 ff. tells of Sisimithres at Nautaca, and of Alexander using an intermediary—Oxyartes—though later in viii. 4. 21 he recounts the submission of Oxyartes to Alexander. Strabo and Plutarch *Alexander* 58 name Sisimithres and Oxyartes, while Arrian *Anabasis* iv. 21. 1-9 associates the latter with Chorienes. On the Clitarchan side we find Persepolis, which the *Anabasis* has in vii. 1. 1. Here it is associated with Pasargada, which Curtius has in v. 6. 10; and x. 1. 22, as has the *Anabasis* in iii. 18. 10; and vi. 29. 1. Diodorus xvii. 76. 6 states that Bucephalus was a gift from Demaratus the Corinthian, who is mentioned by Plutarch *Alexander* 9, 37 and 56, but it is expressly stated in chapter 6 that the horse was bought from Philonices the Thessalian, and this agrees with Pliny *N. H.* viii. 42(64). 154. There are also other evidences of independent sources. Arrian *Anabasis* i. 11. 1 gives Aegae as the place where the games were held; Diodorus xvii. 16. 3 has Dios. Compare *Anabasis* iii. 18. 2 ὡς δὲ ἐπὶ τὰς πύλας τὰς Περσίδας ἀφίκετο, and Diodorus xvii. 68. 1 ἦκεν ἐπὶ τὰς Σουσιῶδας καλουμένας πέτρας.

The Agriani, agema and ἱλη are the names of the divisions of the Macedonian Army most frequently mentioned. The first two are freely used by Arrian, and occasionally by Curtius. Diodorus has only the last, while it occurs frequently in Arrian, and sometimes where in corresponding passages Curtius has *ala*.

Next to the numbers the names are the most uncertain element in the history of Alexander. And this applies to the important as well as to the unimportant. Diodorus xvii. 15. 1 mentions ten orators, but names only the two most important—Demosthenes and Lycurgus. Arrian *Anabasis* i. 10. 4 associates with these two Hyperides, Polyeuctus, Chares, Charidemus, Ephialtes, Diotimus, and Moericles—nine in all. Plutarch *Demosthenes* 23 states that according to Idomeneus and Duris there were ten, but most writers and the most trustworthy give the following: Demosthenes, Polyeuctus, Ephialtes, Lycurgus, Moericles, Demon, Callisthenes and Charidemus. This list has Demon and Callisthenes who are not mentioned by Arrian, while Hyperides, Chares, and Diotimus are omitted.

A difference at any single point does not always indicate a

difference between authors. Diodorus xvii. 64. 5 says that Alexander put Agathon the Pydnaean in command of the citadel at Babylon, making Apollodorus the Amphipolitan and Menes the Pellaeon rulers of Babylon and of the satrapies as far as Cilicia, and giving them 1000 talents of silver. Curtius v. 1. 43 has the last item, but says that Menes and Apollodorus were put over Babylon and Cilicia. Arrian *Anabasis* iii. 16. 4 names only Apollodorus, but in section 9 Menes is given as commander of Syria, Phoenicia and Cilicia. In this statement Curtius agrees with Arrian, as also in the position assigned to Mazaeus, though he alone mentions Bagophanes. Similar to this last is Curtius vii. 6. 12 and vii. 1. 7 where Berdes is named as the messenger to the Scythians, although Arrian *Anabasis* iv. 1. 1 and iv. 15. 1 says that some messengers were sent. There is the same definiteness in Curtius ix. 8. 28 where Moeris is named as king of Patalia. Arrian merely mentions the ruler, though in *Anabasis* v. 18. 7 he speaks of Meroes, a friend of Porus.

There is occasionally a misinterpretation of the Greek by Curtius giving a name which might be taken as a part of the Clitarchan tradition. According to Curtius v. 1. 16 Alexander came *quartis castris* to Mennin: *Caverna ibi est, ex qua fons ingentem bituminis vim effundit, adeo ut satis constet Babylonios muros ingentis operis huius fontis bitumine interlitos esse.* The same region and its fountain of naphtha are mentioned by Strabo xvi. 1. 4 C 738, and Plutarch devotes one long chapter (*Alexander* 35) to the subject. No mention, however, is made of any place, so that the Mennin of Curtius is probably the misinterpretation of some Greek word.

The form of personal designation as well as that of sections of the army in the Aristobulan and the Clitarchan tradition are distinctly different. Curtius, who is largely dependent on Diodorus, and who in this way reproduces Clitarchus, occasionally draws from the other branch of the history of Alexander. This is due to Onesicritus and Clitarchus, whose main characteristics are so much alike, that it is impossible to separate the parts due to each in the history as it has come down to us.

R. B. STEELE.